

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MEDIA MATTERS FOR AMERICA, et
al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

X CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-02397-VC


**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
STAY PENDING APPEAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 65

The motion for a stay pending appeal is denied. X has shown no likelihood that it will be irreparably harmed. Its irreparable harm argument is primarily based on the injunction's comity effects. But an antisuit injunction based on a forum selection clause between private parties does not have an intolerable effect on comity. *See E. & J. Gallo Winery v. Andina Licores S.A.*, 446 F.3d 984, 994 (9th Cir. 2006). And X does not explain how staying the injunction would affect the likelihood that the previous ruling would affect the Singapore litigation (even assuming such an effect would count as irreparable harm). The failure to show irreparable harm suffices on its own to deny the motion to stay. *See Leiva-Perez v. Holder*, 640 F.3d 962, 965 (9th Cir. 2011). But the other stay factors also disfavor a stay: X's arguments regarding likelihood of success on the merits mirror those made in its motion to dismiss and fail for the same reasons. Staying the injunction threatens to injure Media Matters by forcing it to defend at least one additional lawsuit abroad. And the public interest does not favor a stay because the injunction furthers the United States's policy favoring enforcement of valid forum selection clauses and, as noted, does not significantly affect comity. *See Gallo*, 446 F.3d at 994.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 3, 2025



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge